

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The office action of July 29, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 and 16-25 remain pending in this application. Claims 8-15 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and new claims 26-29 have been added.

In Fig. 1, applicants have renumbered the labels associated with the IEEE 1394 Interface (formerly 140) and devices (formerly 150) as these labels were duplicative of ROM 140 and RAM 150. In addition, applicant has amended the specification to change the labeling as well. In Figs. 3 and 4, applicants have corrected a spelling error. Each of Figs. 1-4 are being submitted as formal drawings as well.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-15, 17-18, 20-21 and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 5,652,837 to Warchol et al. ("Warchol"). Claims 4, 12, 16, 19 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warchol. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. To the extent the above rejections applied to claims 8-15, they are deemed moot as these claims have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for remotely managing a computer coupled to a communication bus. The method includes, among other features, receiving, via the communication bus, a management command; determining whether the management command was received via a management port coupled to the communication bus; and when the management command was received via the management port, executing the management command. The action alleges that Warchol shows all the elements of independent claims 1, 16, and 21.

With respect to claim 1 however, the action has failed to identify a teaching or suggestion in Warchol of determining whether the management command was received via a management port coupled to the communication bus, and when the management command was received via the management port, executing the management command.

According to the Warchol system as described at col. 6, lines 58-66, a Futurebus+ i/o device attempts to cause the execution of a command. To issue a command request, the

Futurebus+ i/o device performs a data write operation via the Futurebus+ bus to an i/o module. The data includes an identifier, which uniquely identifies the requesting Futurebus+ i/o device and a command code representing the command being requested. A command register in the i/o module receives the command request. Referring to col. 8, lines 14-32, Warchol describes that an interrupt service routine (ISR) determines the source of the command request by examining the source identifier portion of the data in the command register. Then, based on the source identifier, the ISR determines whether the requesting Futurebus+ i/o device (the source) is authorized to cause execution of the requested command. In sum, Warchol evaluates the source of the command request to determine whether a command can be executed.

In stark contrast, the claim 1 invention does not attempt to determine the source of the management command to determine if the command can be executed. Rather than relying on the source identification to determine if a command can be executed, the claim 1 invention determines whether the management command was *received via a management port* coupled to the communication bus and when the management command *was received via the management port*, executing the management command. Warchol only considers the source of command in determining whether to execute the command and makes no determination as to whether a command can be executed based on whether the receiving port is a management port.

For at least the above reasons, Warchol lacks a teaching or suggestion of the claim 1 combination of features. Claims 2-7, which ultimately depend from claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the advantageous features recited therein.

Independent claim 16 is directed to a computer including a processor; an IEEE 1394 interface, coupled to the processor, comprising at least one port wherein the IEEE 1394 interface passes management commands received from a management port of the at least one port to the processor and ignores any management command received via any port of the at least one port other than the management port; and memory, coupled to the processor, having stored thereon computer executable instructions that, when executed by the processor, cause the computer to execute at least one management command received via the management port.

As discussed with respect to claim 1, Warchol only considers the source of command in determining whether to execute the command and makes no determination as to whether a

command can be executed based on whether the receiving port is a management port. As such, Warchol does not teach or suggest a computer having at least one port wherein the IEEE 1394 interface *passes management commands received from a management port* of the at least one port to the processor and *ignores any management command received via any port of the at least one port other than the management port* and a processor causing the computer to execute at least one management command *received via the management port*. For at least these reasons, claims 16 and dependent claims 17-20 are patentably distinguishable from Warchol.

Independent claim 21 is directed to a computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable components and calls for, among other features, a management command authorization component, in communication with the bus interface component, that determines whether each of the one or more management commands is authorized based on whether each of the one or more management commands was received via a management port coupled to the communication bus. As discussed with respect to claim 1, Warchol only considers the source of command in determining whether to execute the command and makes no determination as to whether a command can be executed based on whether the receiving port is a management port. Thus, claim 21 is patentably distinct from Warchol for at least this reason. Claims 22-25, which ultimately depend from claim 21, are patentably distinguishable from Warchol for the same reasons as claim 21 and further in view of the additional advantageous features recited therein.

New claims 26-29 are fully supported by the specification and considered allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as claim 21, from which they directly or indirectly depend, and further in view of the additional novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.


All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: October 29, 2004

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary D. Fedorochko  
Registration No. 35,509

1001 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001  
GDF:lab

RECEIVED  
 NOV 03 2004  
 Technology Center 2100




FIG. 1





RECEIVED  
NOV 03 2004  
Technology Center 2100




FIG. 3



RECEIVED  
NOV 03 2004  
Technology Center 2100




FIG. 4